

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 WILLIAM SCOTT ROBERTS,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 J. LIZARRAGA

15
16 Respondent.
17

) Case No. CV 15-5234 DOC(JC)

) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS,
) CONCLUSIONS, AND
) RECOMMENDATIONS OF
) UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
) JUDGE

18
19 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of
20 Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody and supporting documents
21 (“Petition”) and all of the records herein, including the October 2, 2017 Report and
22 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (“Report and
23 Recommendation”), and petitioner’s objections to the Report and Recommendation
24 (“Objections”). The Court has further made a *de novo* determination of those
25 portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made.¹ The
26 Court concurs with and accepts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of
27

28
¹This Court, in an exercise of its discretion, declines to consider new evidence presented for the first time in the Objections. See United States v. Howell, 231 F.3d 615, 621 (9th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 831 (2001). The Court nonetheless notes that consideration of such new evidence would not alter the outcome of this matter.

1 the United States Magistrate Judge and overrules the Objections. To the extent
2 petitioner complains that the Report and Recommendation failed to consider his
3 “reply”/“traverse” (Objections at 1, referencing petitioner’s October 7, 2016
4 submission [Docket No. 33] and Report and Recommendation at 2), the Court
5 notes that the document which petitioner now characterizes as his
6 “reply”/“traverse” (Docket No. 33) was filed more than two weeks *before*
7 respondent filed an Answer on October 25, 2016, and thus could not be responsive
8 thereto. In any event, review of the submission petitioner refers to as his
9 “reply”/“traverse” does not alter this Court’s view that the Report and
10 Recommendation is correct and that petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas
11 relief.

12 IT IS ORDERED that Judgment be entered denying the Petition and
13 dismissing this action with prejudice.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk serve copies of this Order, the
15 Report and Recommendation, and the Judgment herein on petitioner and counsel
16 for respondent.

17 LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

18
19 DATED: November 30, 2017

20
21 

22 HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28